EXHIBIT D

30(b)(6) Buck Deposition

March 13, 2008

Chicago, IL

		=		=
	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
	FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS			
	X			
	N RE: PHARMACEUTICAL)			
IN	NDUSTRY AVERAGE WHOLESALE)			
PF	RICE LITIGATION) MDL No. 1456			
) Civil Action			
Th	nis document relates to:) No. 01-12257-PBS			
Ur	nited States of America,)			
ех	c. rel. Ven-a-Care of the)			
Ęl	lorida Keys, Inc.,) Hon. Patti Saris			
	vs.			
Ab	obott Laboratories, Inc.,) Magistrate Judge			
CI	IVIL ACTION NO. 06-11337-PBS) Marianne Bowler			
	·X			
	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF			
	ALEXANDRA GRIGORAS BUCK			
	MARCH 13, 2008			
	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS			
	enfonde, indirecto			

March 13, 2008

Chicago, IL

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

	——————————————————————————————————————		
	2		4
1	Videotaped deposition of ALEXANDRA	1	INDEX
2	GRIGORAS BUCK, called by the Plaintiffs for	2	
3	examination, taken pursuant to notice, agreement and	3	WITNESS: ALEXANDRA GRIGORAS BUCK PAGE
4	by the provisions of the Rules of Civil Procedure	4	EXAMINATION BY MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH 006
5	for the United States District Courts pertaining to	5	EXAMINATION BY MR. ANDERSON 295
6	the taking of depositions, taken before DEBORAH	6	
7	HABIAN, a Notary Public within and for the County of	7	
8	Cook, State of Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand	8	EXHIBITS
9	Reporter of said State, at the offices of Jones Day,	9	
10	77 West Wacker Drive, 35th Floor, Chicago, Illinois,	10	NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE
11	on the 13th day of March, 2008, at 9:10 a.m.	11	Exhibit Buck 001, Notice of Deposition 011
12		12	Exhibit Buck 002, Witness's list of individuals
13		13	interviewed in dep
14	APPEARANCES:	14	preparation 046
15		15	
16	On behalf of the United States:	16	
17	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	17	
18	COMMERCIAL LITIGATION, FRAUD	18	
19	BY: ANN ST. PETER-GRIFFITH, ESQ.	19	
20	99 N.E. 4th Street	20	
21	Miami, Florida 33132	21	
22	(305) 961-9001	22	
	. 3		5
1		1	PROCEEDINGS
	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)	2	PROCEEDINGS
2 3	On babalf of the Polaton Van a Core	3	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is Stephan Hoog
4	On behalf of the Relator, Ven-a-Care:	4	for Henderson Legal Services. I'm the operator
5	ANDERSON, LLC BY: C. JARRETT ANDERSON, ESQ.	5	of this camera. We're on record March 13th,
_	208 West 14th Street	6	2008. The time is 9:10 a.m., as indicated on the
6 7	Suite 3-B	7	video screen.
8	Austin, Texas 78701	8	This is the videotaped deposition of
9		9	Alexandra Buck. It's being taken pursuant to
10	(512) 469-4549	10	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. We are at 77
11	On behalf of the Defendants:	11	West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois. This case
12	JONES DAY	12	is captioned In Re: Pharmaceutical Industry AWP,
13	BY: JASON G. WINCHESTER, ESQ.	13	Case No. 01-12257-PBS.
1 4	77 West Wacker Drive	14	Will the attorneys please identify
15	Chicago, Illinois 60601-1692	15	themselves for the video record?
16	(312) 782-3939	16	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Ann St. Peter-
17	(314) 104-3737	17	Griffith from the United States Attorney's
18		18	Office, Southern District of Florida on behalf of
19	ALSO PRESENT:	19	the United States.
20	ALSO I RESERT.	20	MR. ANDERSON: Jarrett Anderson,
21	STEDHAN HOOG VIDEOGDADHED	21	counsel for the Relator.
22	STEPHAN HOOG, VIDEOGRAPHER	22	MR. WINCHESTER: Jason Winchester for
			MIL WINCIESTER, JASON WHICHOSON TO

March 13, 2008

Chicago, IL

59 (Pages 230 to 233)

-			33 (Tages 230 to 233)
	230		232
1	A. Our attorneys reviewed the documents.	1	Q. And when was that?
2	Q. Did Abbott at all participate in	2	A. I don't know. Probably around the same
3	identifying what documents may or may have been	3	time that we took his e-mail file, which was I
4	responsive may or may not have been	4	believe Mr. Winchester said late last year. I'm
5	responsive?	5	sorry
6	A. I don't know.	6	MR. WINCHESTER: That was Gonzalez.
7	MR. WINCHESTER: You got to let her get	7	THE WITNESS: that was Gonzalez.
8	the question out.	8	I'm sorry. I don't know.
9	THE WITNESS: Sorry.	9	BY MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH:
10	MR. WINCHESTER: That's okay.	10	Q. Okay. Do you know whether it was
11	BY MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH:	11	before or after Mr. Tootell's deposition?
12		12	A. I don't know.
II	Q. And do you have an approximate time		
13	frame as to when that search took place?	13	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Jason, do you
14	A. I do not.	14	have the criteria that was used to search the
15	Q. When did Abbott provide the AHD shared	15	shared drive for AHD?
16	drive electronic information to Jones Day?	16	MR. WINCHESTER: I guess I'm not sure
17	A. I don't know the date.	17	what you're asking about, "criteria."
18	Q. Do you know the year?	18	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Meaning what
19	A. I don't.	19	it was that was searched, what the search terms
20	Q. Do you know what else was involved in	20	were for pulling responsive documents.
21	the search of the shared drive of AHD?	21	MR. WINCHESTER: Oh. I don't know that
22	A. I don't think there was anything else	22	there were search terms on that one. I think
	231		233
1	involved.	1	that literally it was a document-by-document
2	Q. Okay, so we've exhausted what you know	2	review that was, you know, culled just for
3	about that?	3	responsiveness according to the Court's rulings
4	A. Yes.	4	and, you know, however you would look through a
5	Q. Okay. Next. You searched the AHD	5	box of paper. It was done that way with this
6	drive?	6	stuff on the shared drives.
7	A. Correct.	7	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Okay.
8	Q. Okay, what else?	8	MR. WINCHESTER: I don't believe it was
. 9	A. I believe we – I stated earlier that	9	done by way of hits from key terms. It was
10		10	literally reviewed
11		11	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Yeah, that's
12		12	my question more.
13		13	MR. WINCHESTER: Yes.
14		14	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: So it was just
15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	15	a pure
16	• ,	16	MR. WINCHESTER: Review.
17		17	MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: - Jones Day
18		ı	
19		18	attorney sitting there or paralegal or somebody
11		19	sitting there reviewing.
20		20	MR. WINCHESTER: Yes, pure staff
21	•	21	reviewing what was on the share drive.
22	provided it to Jones Day.	22	BY MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH:

March 13, 2008

Chicago, IL

74 (Pages 290 to 293)

_	(14gcs 250 to 255)	_	202
	290		292
1	your knowledge?	1	the problem with databases.
2	A. I don't know.	2	Q. Before the price lists were put on
3	Q. What types of databases existed within	3	databases
4	or for the Home Infusion Business Unit?	4	A. I don't know that they were.
5	A. I am not aware. I don't know.	5	Q. Okay. Does Abbott what did did
6	Q. What about for the Alt Site Business	6	Abbott do anything to search for price lists that
7	Unit?	7.	might have existed on an individual's computer
8	A. I don't know.	8	other than the lit hold?
9	Q. HBS?	9	A. I mean certainly if an individual was
10	A. I don't know.	10	looking for documents, I – price lists would be
11	e a man may may a suppose of man	11	included. I don't know if there was some
12	and the second of the second o	12	database search or even database containing such
13	3	13	lists. I really don't know about the price
14	and the same of th	14	lists.
15 16	, ,	15	Q. Other than what we've discussed, are
16	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	16	you aware of any initiative to and I'm now
17		17	talking about the current initiative to search
18		18	desktops.
19	,	19	Are you aware of from '96 when
20		20	Abbott first started receiving, you know,
21	,	21	information from the government concerning its
22		22	investigation until the time of the Hospira spin,
ľ	291		293
1	discovery's side, trying to figure out how to do	1	was any initiative undertaken to search desktops
2	that.	2	other than what was expected through the Ellen
3	Q. Okay. Well, incident to lit hold	3	Klaus initiative?
4	memoranda, was any effort made to because of	4	A. There is something that I want to
5	the changing nature of price lists of price	5	clarify that I'm not sure if I mentioned earlier.
6	list database or price lists, was any initiative	6	At the time that we pulled Mr. Gonzalez's e-mail,
7	undertaken to electrically preserve that	7	we did also take a ghost image of his computer,
8	information?	8	reviewed every document document-by-document and
9	A. I guess what I'm saying is that there	9	found that no documents were responsive, and I'm
10	is no way that I'm aware of to preserve database	10	not sure that I made that clear earlier.
11	information on an ongoing basis, and I don't know	11	Q. And who did that search?
12	whether any steps were taken to preserve the data	12	A. Jones Day. And just to be clear, it
13	that you're you referring to or whether it	13	was a review. There was no search terms. It
14	existed in a database at all.	14	was, again, a review of the entire drive.
15	Q. Well, is it possible to implement a	15	Q. Okay. And was that his computer as it
16	system where, you know, on a weekly basis a	16	from his term as President of HPD or as
17	snapshot of what the price list was for that	17	Chairman term or some other - when he was in -
18	particular week or that particular month was	18	held some other position?
19	captured?	19	A. I
20	A. I am not aware of a system that you can	20	MR. WINCHESTER: Objection, form.
21	take snapshots of databases that you would be	21	THE WITNESS: I believe it – well,
22	able to then use that data subsequently. That's	22	actually, I don't know the time frame.

March 13, 2008

Chicago, IL

75 (Pages 294 to 297)

296 294 BY MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: 1 A. I don't know. It was a decision, I 2 2 Q. Okay, was any initiative undertaken to believe, made by our attorneys. 3 search Rick Gonzalez's computer that he utilized 3 Q. Were there any other individuals whose when he was President of HPD? hard drives were reviewed by Abbott or its 5 A. I don't know. 5 counsel? 6 6 Q. Have we exhausted your knowledge or A. In the same manner that Mike Tootell 7 7 recollection of the searches undertaken for and Mr. Gonzalez's computer were reviewed? 8 8 electronic information by Abbott in response to Q. Let's limit it to that for now, and 9 9 the United States's request for production? then we'll broaden it. 10 A. I believe we have. 10 A. Not that I am aware of. 11 Q. Is there anything that you would like 11 Q. Okay, were other Abbott employees' hard 12 to clarify or, as you sit here today, think back 12 drives reviewed by individuals other than the 13 about that you want to either expand upon or 13 particular employee who actually possessed the 14 clarify? 14 hard drive? 15 15 A. No. A. Sure. So I think as I testified 16 MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Okay. Jason, 16 earlier and Miss Klaus referenced, there were 17 17 I want - as I indicated before, one of the numerous occasions where the paralegal would sit 18 18 with the individual and go through their hard questions that we had was who exactly it was that 19 19 drive document-by-document and decide what to the lit - responded to the lit hold memoranda, 20 which is really - Ms. Buck has referenced it 20 print out. 21 21 Q. Okay, and there's been some testimony here today, but that's really a question that was 22 22 about this kind of over-the-shoulder review presented with Ellen Klaus. 297 295 1 MR. WINCHESTER: Um-hum. process. How would the -- well, strike that. 2 2 MS. ST. PETER-GRIFFITH: Subject to With what frequency has Abbott or 3 3 Abbott's attorneys conducted a process where a getting more information concerning that, at this 4 4 paralegal or some other Abbott representative time, the United States passes the witness. 5 MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, Ms. would physically sit with an Abbott employee and 6 6 search the Abbott employee's electronic records? Buck. 7 7 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. A. So my understanding is that every time 8 8 there was a collection, that process was MR. ANDERSON: My name is Jarrett 9 9 followed. And there were collections responsive Anderson. I don't have many questions, but I do 10 have a few. 10 to either numerous subpoenas over this period of 11 THE WITNESS: Okay. 11 time or document requests, et cetera. So I can't 12 12 say for certain with what frequency per 13 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION individual, but I know it was done repeatedly. 14 14 BY MR. ANDERSON: Q. And is it true that the individuals 15 15 Q. Leaving off where you just were, if I which were identified for this level of over-the-16 16 shoulder review were the 39 individuals that were understand your testimony correctly, Mike 17 Tootell's hard drive and Rick Gonzalez's hard identified in the class action case? 18 18 drive were duplicated and then, in turn, reviewed A. That, I don't know. Like I said 19 19 by Abbott's counsel, correct? earlier, I don't know the specific names of the 20 20 A. That is correct. individuals. 21 21 Q. Why were those two individuals selected Q. Do you know of records that would 22 reveal which persons have been subjected to this for that review?

March 13, 2008

Chicago, IL

84 (Pages 330 to 333)

330 332 records of its employees other than asking agree though that, while there may not have been 1 1 2 individual employees to do so themselves? 2 a date limitation placed on the search, those 3 MR. WINCHESTER: Objection, form. 3 sources inherently were limited because the 4 4 historic reach of those bodies of electronic THE WITNESS: No, I absolutely 5 5 information was limited? disagree. And continually minimizing the effort 6 that our paralegals and our attorneys did to go 6 MR. WINCHESTER: Objection, form. 7 7 to computers with individuals and search, THE WITNESS: I do not agree. 8 BY MR. ANDERSON: electronically look at -- physically, personally look at those files I think is a 9 Q. You don't? 10 10 mischaracterization. A. Nope. 11 11 Q. Despite your testimony about the 30-day Additionally, I've testified at length 12 12 about the share drive searches, again, about the deleter or the minimum inbox size or other 13 13 functional limits on the historic retention of Medi-Cal searches, about the AHD share drives and other things that I'm sure I'm missing now in 14 documents? 15 15 this summary of my testimony all day. A. That is absolutely correct. The -16 16 BY MR. ANDERSON: it's actually - especially because the 30-day 17 17 Q. Well, I'm not trying to argue with you deleter wasn't implemented until the very end of 18 18 2003. The practice was if you were going to about the merits of the kind of the over-the-19 19 shoulder review. I'm just trying to understand reach your limit, it was to save those e-mails 20 whether Abbott did any type of organizational 20 and those PST files. 21 21 electronic search of its employees' records other We've conducted thorough searches of 22 22 than the over-the-shoulder type review and the those PSTs, we've conducted searches of the sbare 331 333 1 1 drives and of each individual computer prior to Medi-Cal body of information that was reviewed and the 2002 and post-2002 body of information 2 the time. So I'm just - I disagree. 3 3 Q. Do you know of any reasons why Abbott that was reviewed? 4 MR. WINCHESTER: Objection, asked and 4 would not search the computer records of Mike 5 5 answered. Sellers? 6 6 A. What do you mean "computer records"? THE WITNESS: It's just a 7 mischaracterization of what I've been testifying 7 Q. Well, if I understand correctly, for 8 about all day. 8 instance, when Mr. Tootell or Mr. Gonzalez left 9 9 the employ of Abbott, their hard drives were The share drive for the HPD was 10 10 absolutely not limited to 2002. The PSTs were saved and then, in turn, reviewed, correct? 11 11 searched for, as we -- as I testified, and we A. That's my understanding. 12 produced close to 18,000 e-mails that dated back Q. Do you -- do you know a gentleman by 13 13 to much previous to 2002. We also searched the the name of Mike Sellers? 14 AHD share drive without any date limitation on 14 A. I do not. 15 15 that except through 2003, and again, I've Q. Okay, I'll represent to you that he's 16 retired --testified for hours today on other repositories. 17 And I'm not going to resummarize again. Other A. Okay. 18 18 Q. -- fairly recently, and I'm wondering than what I've testified today, I don't have 19 19 anything else to add to that. why his hard drive was not also retained and 20 BY MR. ANDERSON: 20 searched similar to the procedure followed by Mr. 21 21 Tootell and Mr. Gonzalez. Q. Well, with respect to the categories of 22 information that you just rattled off, you'll A. I don't know.